

(1) a precipitous change in the calculation of the Consumer Price Index that would result in an increase in income taxes and a decrease in Social Security benefits is not the appropriate way to resolve this issue; and

(2) any change in the calculation of the Consumer Price Index should result from thoughtful study and analysis and should be a result of a consensus reached by the experts, not pressure exerted by politicians.

DORGAN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 180

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, AND MR. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 1, supra; as follows:

On page 38 after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 205. TERMINATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR METRIC SYSTEM OF MEASUREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b) and (c) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, no department, agency, or other entity of the Federal Government may require that any State, local, or tribal government utilize a metric system of measurement.

(b) EXCEPTION.—A department, agency, or other entity of the Federal Government may require the utilization of a metric system of measurement by a State, local, or tribal government in a particular activity, project, or transaction that is pending on the date of the enactment of this Act if the head of such department, agency, or other entity determines that the termination of such requirement with respect to such activity, project, or transaction will result in a substantial additional cost to the Federal Government in such activity, project, or transaction.

(c) SUNSET.—Subsection (a) shall cease to be effective on October 1, 1997.

On page 41, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(4) TREATMENT OF REQUIREMENT FOR METRIC SYSTEMS OF MEASUREMENT.—

(A) TREATMENT.—For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2), the Commission shall consider requirements for metric systems of measurement to be unfunded mandates.

(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term "requirements for metric systems of measurement" means requirements of the departments, agencies, and other entities of the Federal Government that State, local, and tribal governments utilize metric systems of measurement.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will hold a full committee hearing on Tuesday, February 7, 1995, at 9:30 a.m., in room 332 of the Russell Senate Office Building. The topic for the hearing is "What Tax Policy Reforms Will Help Strengthen American Agriculture and Agribusiness?" For further information, please contact Katherine Brunett of the Agriculture Committee staff at 244-9778.

Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will hold a full committee hearing on Tues-

day, February 14, 1995, at 9:30 a.m., in room 332 of the Russell Senate Office Building. The topic for the hearing is "What Regulatory Reforms Will Help Strengthen Agriculture and Agribusiness?" For further information, please contact Terri Nintemann of the Agriculture Committee staff at 244-3921.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, January 19, 1995, in open session, to receive testimony on the condition of the Armed Forces and future trends.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be allowed to meet during the Thursday, January 19, 1995, session of the Senate for the purpose of conducting a hearing on the issue of the nomination of Robert Pitofsky, of Maryland, to be Federal Trade Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meeting during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 19, 1995, for purposes of conducting a full committee oversight hearing which is scheduled to begin at 2 p.m. The purpose of the hearing is to review the implications of the North Korean nuclear framework.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for a hearing on oversight of Jobs Corps, during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 19, 1995, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 19, 1995, at 9:15 a.m., to hold hearings on Senate committee funding resolutions. The committee will receive testimony from the chairmen and ranking members of the following committees: Intelligence, Appropriations, Labor, Indian Affairs, Commerce, Banking, Governmental Affairs, Veterans' Affairs, Armed Services, Environment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CHECHNYA AND THE FUTURE OF RUSSIAN CIVIL SOCIETY

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I am sure that, like me, my colleagues in this Chamber have been appalled by the pictures coming out of Chechnya. There is a grim familiarity to the events taking place there. Massive military force sent by Moscow to take on lightly armed, or unarmed, civilians: this is something we saw in Hungary in 1956, in Czechoslovakia in 1968, in Afghanistan in 1979. We hoped we wouldn't see it again.

With Chechnya, though, we are also seeing something new, and very significant. With the exception of the ultranationalists on the one hand, and the diehard pro-Yeltsin camp on the other, Russian public opinion has risen up in outspoken opposition to a war they feel is not worth the cost. Not worth the cost in lives; not worth the cost in money; not worth the cost to Russia's name in the world community.

Freedom of speech is one of the foundations of a democratic system, and there's no guarantees that that freedom, or that democracy itself, have taken permanent root in Russia. But the reaction of the Russian public to the war in Chechnya is a heartening indication that the first shoots of a civil society are beginning to appear in Russia.

In a recent column William Safire makes this point very well, contrasting the tumultuous energy of Russia's political environment with the deceptive stability of one-party rule in China. I ask that Mr. Safire's column "Yeltsin's Tiananmen," be printed in the RECORD in full.

The column follows:

YELTSIN'S TIANANMEN

WASHINGTON.—Which great power is more unstable today—China or Russia?

The quick answer, of course, is Russia. The elected leader, Boris Yeltsin, is besieged in Moscow after his bloody siege of Grozny, capital of the Connecticut-sized breakaway republic of Chechnya.

Russian television showed vivid pictures of the bombing of that city even as it showed Yeltsin saying it wasn't so; then the cameras showed Yeltsin upbraiding his Defense Minister for making him look like a liar.

As Helmut Kohl telephoned to tell him that world opinion frowns on the savage method his Russia Federation is using to preserve its borders, Bill Clinton wrote a "Dear Boris" letter reaffirming support of Federation unity but stressing how "distressed" he is at civilian deaths and suggesting mediation by an organization of 53 nations.

What's Yeltsin to do? The Chechens are dead serious about secession. If Russia lets Chechnya go, other Causasian dominoes will fall and Moscow will be denied the Caspian oil it needs to rule a hundred nationalities across 11 time zones.

He tried negotiation, which was met by a declaration of independence; he tried an internal coup, which flopped; now he's trying force, which is bringing world obloquy on his head because the Chechens are fiercely fighting for their homeland and the Russian Army has no heart for a lengthy guerrilla battle, especially after its loss in Afghanistan.

All that—added to Yeltsin's personal punchiness and isolation—is why Russia appears unstable. We tend to equate the future of democracy with the future of Yeltsin, who is on his last leg.

But consider the political miracle taking place in Moscow today. An unpopular and unjust war is being denounced in the Parliament, with reformer Grigory Yavlinsky, openly calling for Yeltsin's resignation. The military is publicly divided between conscience-stricken warriors and hard-line incompetents. Free speech is spilling out all over.

The newspapers, after centuries of czarist and Communist docility, are crusading; a picture of Defense Minister Pavel Grachev is captioned "the most talentless commander in Russia." And the television crews are bringing home the horror of the war just as American cameramen did in Vietnam, with similar impact on Russian public opinion.

This is wonderful. The world should be proud of the Russian people, who should be prouder of themselves for exercising their new-found freedom to debate a great issue.

Contrast that democratic turmoil to the facade of "stability" in China. With the death of Deng Xiaoping imminent, the leadership is cracking down on dissidents.

By jailing its leading independent thinkers, the regime in Beijing reveals its inherent weakness. The new imprisonment of the courageous Wei Jingsheng, China's Sakharov, was the tip-off that the leadership fears a popular uprising, this time led by angry workers rather than idealistic students. As Deng sinks, the number of panicky arrests rises.

This demonstrates again that succession in a Communist state is a ruthless wrestle for power within an impenetrable clique. It mocks the assurances of China's Western apologists that a market economy leads to political freedom.

In a litchi nutshell, here's the play:

Yang Shangkun, an old army leader whose powerful family was neutralized by Deng, is close to Adm. Liu Huaqing, the nation's top military leader. They may challenge Deng's protégés, party boss Jiang Zemin and Prime Minister Li Peng, by backing economic chief, Zhu Rongji, or promoting a next-generation politician, Hu Jintao, or by backing Qiao Shi, the former national security adviser and now chairman of the rubber-stamp People's Congress, hereinafter known as "China's Newt Gingrich."

What do 1.2 billion Chinese have to say about all this? Zilch. (Analysts in Beijing, aware of the exclusive accuracy of my prediction of Mao's successor in the 70's, will have to puzzle out "zilch.") And therein lies real instability.

A monolithic, totalitarian state, repressing the spirit of freedom, only seems secure; we have seen how it can suddenly collapse. A noisy, unruly democratic state, drawing on the legitimacy of free elections, is more secure—no matter how shaky the leadership. That's why Russia is in better political shape than China.●

LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1990

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join as a cosponsor of legislation to require that the Environmental Protection Agency allow States to meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act as intended by Congress by pursuing options that best meet their own circumstances.

As a member of the Committee on Environment and Public Works during the development of the Clean Air Act in 1990, I can confirm that it was recognized that the requirements for an enhanced inspection and maintenance program would require some States to modify their current emission test and repair programs. It was our full intention, however, to allow States to operate a decentralized automobile emissions inspection and maintenance program to meet the requirements of the act.

In developing regulations to implement the enhanced I&M program, EPA did not follow the direction of the Congress and provisions of the statute. Instead, EPA mandated that States operate a centralized testing program by giving States only 50 percent credit toward achieving the 15-percent reduction in emissions if they elected to sponsor a decentralized program.

As States have attempted to work with EPA to develop emission reduction plans that would comply with the act, it has become clear that the Agency is mandating that States implement only one approach. This inflexible approach limits the ability of our States to pursue programs unique to their circumstances. Mr. President, I believe that encouraging States to devise their own programs with assistance from the Federal Government is the crucial element in whether any Federal program is successful or not. As EPA has consistently demanded a centralized testing program which uses the very costly IM-240 equipment, the program is on the brink of failure. States are overwhelmingly rejecting EPA's version of an enhanced I&M program, consumers are losing confidence in the benefits of an automobile emissions program and valuable resources are being wasted.

Mr. President, there is more than one way to ensure that we achieve the maximum amount of automobile emissions reductions in our fight to improve air quality, but EPA is threatening States with the loss of critical highway funds unless States do it only their way.

Mr. President, that is not what the law says and that is not what our States should be required to do.

The Clean Air Act specifically allows for States to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Administrator that a decentralized program will be equally effective to a centralized testing program. In the case of my State, Virginia has been repeatedly denied the opportunity by EPA to show that their revised decentralized test and repair pro-

gram would be as effective as a centralized program in meeting air quality standards.

Since early last year, Virginia has attempted to work with EPA to develop a program that would bring the northern Virginia area into compliance with air quality standards. Unfortunately, EPA has been less concerned with the results of my State's emissions reduction plan, than with the process Virginia chooses to achieve these results.

In an effort to comply with the Clean Air Act, Virginia has presented two plans. The first plan was rejected by EPA because it included a decentralized test and repair program with operator certification and more enforcement, as opposed to a fully centralized program operated by State employees or State-hired contractors. The second plan which Virginia has offered has been the subject of extensive discussions, but no final resolution. The last meeting occurred on October 20, 1994, between EPA and Virginia with EPA pledging to respond to the State's proposal. To date, EPA has not responded.

During this time, Virginia has operated under a regulatory determination known as a protective finding for transportation conformity. This designation allows transportation projects to go forward on the assumption that Virginia will soon have an approved emissions reduction plan.

Time is short, Mr. President, and our protective finding expires this month. The EPA has repeatedly stated that, without an approved plan, Virginia would be subject to the loss of over \$378 million in annual highway funds which Virginia drivers have paid into the highway trust fund. Also, any new transportation projects proposed for addition to our Transportation Improvement Program until Virginia's 15 percent emissions reduction plan is approved.

These are significant penalties because it means that new major highway plans or modifications to existing plans cannot go forward. Not only would approval for Federal projects be denied, State and local approvals for projects on larger roads would be prohibited.

Mr. President, northern Virginia, an area already choking on traffic gridlock that paralyzes our lives daily and results in a tremendous loss of economic productivity, must not suffer from EPA's bureaucratic inflexibility. Should EPA repeal Virginia's protective finding, 138 million dollar's worth of northern Virginia projects in 1995 alone would be impacted.

Mr. President, these are extremely harsh penalties that bear no relationship to the issues at hand. Virginia has committed to improving air quality to meet the Federal standards. We only ask that we be permitted as provided in the law to select the most cost effective options that will achieve these important goals.